

### REMARKS

Initially, Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended in the recent in-person interview held with Applicant's representative. The amendments and remarks presented herein are consistent with those discussions. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, mailed February 2, 2007, considered and rejected claims 1-16. Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Berger* (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0195221).<sup>1</sup> Additionally, claim 9 was objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 7.<sup>2</sup>

By this paper, claims 1, 6 and 9 have been amended, and no claims have been added or cancelled.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, following this paper, claims 1-16 remain pending, of which claim 1 is the only independent claim at issue.

As discussed during the interview, Applicant's claims are generally directed to a method for displaying information on a device that has limited display capabilities. For example, as reflected in claim 1, a method is recited for displaying a readable page despite the limited display capabilities of the mobile device, and includes dividing content into regions and displaying a plurality of regions together as a thumbnail, in a reduced size, on a display of the mobile computing device. A request to display one of the regions is then detected and the thumbnail is replaced by an enlarged version of the selected region. From the displayed selected region, a request is then detected to display a second region and, before the second region is displayed, the thumbnail is temporarily displayed in a manner that highlights the newly selected second region. The second region is then displayed.

While *Berger* generally relates to methods and systems for displaying information on a mobile device, it fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the pending claims. For example, as discussed in the interview, among other things, *Berger* fails to disclose or suggest a

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

<sup>2</sup> As discussed during the interview, claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection is now overcome.

<sup>3</sup> Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout Applicant's original disclosure, including at least the disclosure at pp. 15 and 16 of the originally filed application, as well as in the originally filed figures and claims.

method in which a thumbnail image of the multiple regions is displayed, replaced by a selected region, and then temporarily displayed after a request to access a second region is made, as claimed in combination with the other claim elements.

In particular, *Berger* discloses a system in which a document is segmented, rasterized and converted to an imagemap/thumbnail which presents a segmented display on the device. (§§ 50, 55). These segments are selectable for viewing in an enhanced viewing mode. (*Id.*). When selected, the segments can be displayed in one of two different manners. First, when a segment is selected from the segmented display, an enlarged version of the segment replaces the segmented display on the display and is converted to a narrow-screen layout to allow scrolling through the page in only the vertical direction. (§§ 55, 64, 95). From this page, the user may scroll to another region or may select a "back" button to move back to the segmented display. (§ 99). Thus, when a region is selected, the existing image is removed and the selected region is displayed. (§ 105).

In the second viewing mode the display device has a split-screen configuration. (§ 108). The first panel presents the segmented display which has been scaled to fit within the panel. (*Id.*). The second panel then presents the segment of the segmented display which is active, such as the display which has been selected by the user. (§§ 110, 112). The image in the second panel may also change. For instance, the user can scroll within the second panel and when the user reaches a boundary of that region, the adjacent image from the raster image displayed in the first panel can replace the original image in the second panel. (§ 114). Accordingly, in the second embodiment, the segmented image/thumbnail remain shown in the first panel while the second panel switches between selected portions of the segmented image.

Thus, in contrast to the claimed invention, in which a thumbnail image is temporarily displayed in response to detecting a request to display a second region and then removed for displaying of the second region on the display, *Berger* describes that: (1) after selection of a second image, the second image automatically replaces the first image without reverting to the thumbnail; or (2) the thumbnail is always displayed such that it is not temporarily displayed or displayed in response to detecting a request to display a second region. In other words, the thumbnail image in *Berger* is not re-shown on the display when a new region is selected, and particularly not re-shown in response to selection of a new segment, as recited in combination with the other claim elements.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 1<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
COLBY C. NUTTALL  
Registration No. 58,146  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 047973